

# Physical unknowables\*

Karl Svozil<sup>†</sup>

*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Vienna University of Technology,  
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/136, A-1040 Vienna, Austria*

## Abstract

A variety of physical unknowables will be discussed. Provable lack of physical omniscience, omnipredictability and omnipotence is derived by reduction to problems which are known to be recursively unsolvable. “Chaotic” symbolic dynamical systems are unstable with respect to variations of initial states. Quantum unknowables include the random occurrence of single events, complementarity and value indefiniteness.

PACS numbers: 01.70.+w, 01.65.+g, 02.30.Lt, 03.65.Ta

Keywords: Unknowables, Church-Turing thesis, induction and forecast, n-body problem, quantum indeterminism

---

\* Contribution to the international symposium “Horizons of Truth” celebrating the 100th birthday of Kurt Gödel at the University of Vienna from April 27th-29th, 2006

<sup>†</sup> [svozil@tuwien.ac.at](mailto:svozil@tuwien.ac.at); <http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil>

## CONTENTS

|                                                                                    |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. Rise and fall of determinism                                                    | 3  |
| A. Toward explanation and feasibility                                              | 4  |
| B. Rise of indeterminism                                                           | 6  |
| II. Provable physical unknowables                                                  | 8  |
| A. Intrinsic self-referential observers                                            | 9  |
| B. Unpredictability                                                                | 11 |
| C. The busy beaver function as the maximal recurrence time                         | 13 |
| D. Undecidability of the induction problem                                         | 14 |
| E. Impossibility                                                                   | 14 |
| F. Results in classical recursion theory with implications for theoretical physics | 15 |
| III. Deterministic chaos                                                           | 15 |
| A. Instabilities in classical motion                                               | 15 |
| B. Rate of convergence                                                             | 17 |
| IV. Quantum unknowables                                                            | 19 |
| A. Random events                                                                   | 20 |
| B. Complementarity                                                                 | 22 |
| C. Value indefiniteness versus omniscience                                         | 24 |
| V. Miracles due to gaps in causal description                                      | 27 |
| VI. Concluding thoughts                                                            | 27 |
| A. Metaphysical status of (in)determinism                                          | 27 |
| B. Harnessing unknowables and indeterminism                                        | 28 |
| C. Personal remarks                                                                | 29 |
| Acknowledgements                                                                   | 30 |
| References                                                                         | 30 |

*“... as we know, there are known knowns;  
there are things we know we know.*

*We also know there are known unknowns;  
that is to say we know there are some things we do not know.*

*But there are also unknown unknowns –  
the ones we don’t know we don’t know.”*

*United States Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld  
at a Department of Defense news briefing on February 12, 2002*

*“ei mihi, qui nescio saltem quid nesciam!”*

*[“Alas for me, that I do not at least know the extent of my own ignorance!”]*

*Aurelius Augustinus, 354-430, “Confessiones (Confessions),” (Book XI, Chapter 25)*

## **I. RISE AND FALL OF DETERMINISM**

In what follows, a variety of physical unknowables will be discussed. Provable lack of physical omniscience, omnipredictability and omnipotence is derived by reduction to problems which are known to be recursively unsolvable. “Chaotic” symbolic dynamical systems are unstable with respect to variations of initial states. Quantum unknowables include the random occurrence of single events, complementarity and value indefiniteness.

From antiquity onward, various waves of (in)determinism have dominated human thought. Regardless of whether they were shaped by some “Zeitgeist,” or whether, as Goethe’s *Faust* puts it, “*What you the Spirit of the Ages call, Is nothing but the spirit of you all, Wherein the Ages are reflected,*” their proponents have sometimes vigorously defended their stance in irrational, unscientific, and ideological ways. Indeed, from an emotional point of view, may it not appear frightening to be “imprisoned” by remorseless, relentless predetermination, even in a dualistic setup [1]; and, equally frightening, to accept that one’s fate depends on total arbitrariness and chance? Does determinism expose freedom, self-determination and human dignity as an idealistic illusion? And, on the other extreme, what kind of morale, merits and efforts appear worthy in a universe governed by pure chance? Is there some “reasonable in-between” those extreme positions which may also be consistent with science?

We shall, for the sake of separating the scientific debate from emotional overtones and possible

bias, adopt a contemplative strategy of *evenly-suspended attention* outlined by Freud [2], who admonishes analysts to be aware of the dangers caused by “... *temptations to project, what [[the analyst]] in dull self-perception recognizes as the peculiarities of his own personality, as generally valid theory into science . . .*” Nature is thereby treated as a “client-patient,” and whatever findings come up are accepted “as is,” without any immediate emphasis or judgment.

### **A. Toward explanation and feasibility**

Throughout history, the human desire to foresee and manipulate the physical world for survival and prosperity, and in accord with personal wishes and fantasies, has been confronted with the inability to predict and manipulate large portions of the habitat. As time passed, people have figured out various ways to tune ever increasing fragments of the world according to their needs. From a purely behavioral perspective, this is brought about in the way of pragmatic quasi-causal conditional rules of the following kind, “if one does this, one obtains that.” A typical example of such a rule is, “if I rub my hands, they get warmer.”

How does one arrive at those kinds of rules? Guided by suspicions, thoughts, formalisms and by pure chance, inquiries start by “roaming around,” inspecting portions of the world and examining their behavior. Repeating patterns of behavior are observed and “pinned down” by reproducing them. A physical behavior is anything that can be observed and thus operationally obtained and measured; e.g., the rise and fall of the sun, the ignition of fire, the formation and the melting of ice.

As physical behaviors are observed, people attempt to “understand” them by trying to figure out some the “cause” [3] or “reason” for their occurrences. Researchers invent virtual parallel worlds of thoughts and intellectual concepts such as “electric field” or “mechanical force” to “explain” and manipulate the physical behaviors, calling these creations of their minds “physical theories.” Contemporary physical theories are heavily formalized and spelled out in the language of mathematics. A “good theory” provides people with the feeling of a “key” unlocking new ways of world comprehension and manipulation. Ideally, an “explanation” should be as compact as possible and should apply to as many behavioral patterns as possible.

Ultimately, theories of everything [4, 5] should be able to predict and manipulate “all” phenomena. In the extreme form, science becomes omniscient and omnipotent, and we envision ourselves almost as becoming empowered with “magic:” we presume that our ability to manipulate and

tune the world is limited by our fantasies alone, and any constraints whatsoever can be bypassed or overcome one way or another. Indeed, some of what in the past has been called supernatural, mystery and the beyond has been realized in everyday life. Many wonders of witchcraft have been transferred into the realm of the physical sciences. Take, for example, our abilities to fly, the capability to transmute mercury into gold [6], to listen and speak to far away friends, or to cure bacterial diseases with a few pills of antibiotics.

Until about 1900, the fast growing natural sciences, guided by rational [7] and empirical [8, 9] thinking, and seconded by the European Enlightenment, prospered under the assumption of physical determinism. Under the *aegis* of physical determinism, all incapacities to predict and manipulate physical behavior were interpreted to be merely *epistemic* in nature, purporting that, with growing precision of measurements and improvements of theory, all physical unknowables will eventually be overcome and turned into knowables. That is, “everything” should in principle be knowable. Even “statistical” quantities would describe underlying deterministic behaviors. Consequently, there could not exist any physical behavior or entity without a cause “stimulating” or “pushing” it into existence.

The uprise of determinism culminated in the following statement by Laplace [10, Chapter II]:

*“Present events are connected with preceding ones by a tie based upon the evident principle that a thing cannot occur without a cause which produces it. This axiom, known by the name of the principle of sufficient reason, extends even to actions which are considered indifferent . . .*

*We ought then to regard the present state of the universe as the effect of its anterior state and as the cause of the one which is to follow. Given for one instant an intelligence which could comprehend all the forces by which nature is animated and the respective situation of the beings who compose it an intelligence sufficiently vast to submit these data to analysis it would embrace in the same formula the movements of the greatest bodies of the universe and those of the lightest atom; for it, nothing would be uncertain and the future, as the past, would be present to its eyes.”*

The invention of (analytic) functions reflects this paradigm quite nicely: some dispersionless “point coordinate” [11]  $x(t)$  of infinite precision serves as the representation of a physical state as a (unique) function of physical time  $t$ .

Indeed, the possibility to formulate theories *per se*; and in particular the applicability of formal,

mathematical models, comes as a “mind-boggling” surprise and cannot be taken for granted; there appears to be what Wigner called an “unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences” [12]. Even today there is a “Pythagorean consensus” that there is no limit to dealing with physical entities in terms of mathematical formalism. So, as mathematics increasingly served as a proper representation of reality, algorithmics started to become a metaphor for physics.

The natural sciences succeeded to prosper uninhibited by any sense of limits until about *fin de siècle* around 1900. In parallel, the formalization of mathematics progressed in an equally uninhibited way. Hilbert demanded that nobody should ever expel mathematicians from the paradise created by Cantor’s set theory, and posed a challenge [13] to search for a consistent, finite system of formal axioms which would be able to render all mathematical and physical truth; just as quasi-finitistic ways to cope with infinitesimal calculus had been found.

This type of belief system claiming omniscience could be called “deterministic conjecture;” since no proof for its validity can be given; nor is there any test for its falsification [14] presented. Actually, “omniscience” can be “effectively” disproved on a daily basis by everybody tuning in to the local weather forecasts.

Furthermore, it seems to be an enduring desire of human nature to be able to trust the rules and theories not merely syntactically and operationally [15], but to be able to semantically interpret them as implying and carrying some ontological significance or “truth;” as if “reality would communicate with us, mediated through our senses, thereby revealing the laws governing nature.” Stated pointedly, we not only wish to accept physical theories as pure abstractions and constructions of our own mind [16], but we associate meaning and truth to them; so much so that only very reluctantly we admit their preliminary, transient and changing character [17].

## **B. Rise of indeterminism**

Almost unnoticed the tide of indeterminism started to build up toward the end of the nineteenth century [5, 18]. At that time mechanistic theories faced an increasing number of “anomalies:” Poincaré’s discovery of “instabilities” of trajectories of celestial bodies, which made them extremely sensible to initial conditions, radioactivity [19, 20], X rays, specific heats of gases and solids, emission and absorption of light, in particular blackbody radiation, the (ir)reversibility dichotomy between classical reversible mechanics and Boltzmann’s statistical-mechanical theory of entropy *versus* the second law of thermodynamics, as well as classical “constructions” of the ether

as a medium for the propagation of light waves, and their experimental refutation.

After the year 1900 followed a short period of revolutionary new physics, in particular quantum theory and relativity theory, without any strong inclination toward (in)determinism. Then, indeterminism erupted with Born's claim that quantum mechanics has it both ways: the quantum state evolves deterministically, whereas the individual outcome occurs indeterministically. Born also stated that he *believed* that there is no cause for an individual quantum event; i.e., such an outcome occurs irreducibly at random.

There followed a fierce controversy, with many researchers such as Born, Bohr, Heisenberg and Pauli taking the indeterministic stance, while others, like Planck [21], Einstein [22, 23], Schrödinger and De Brogli, leaning toward determinism. This latter position was pointedly put forward by Einstein's *dictum* in a letter to Born, dated December 12th, 1926 [24, p. 113], "*In any case I am convinced that he [[the Old One]] does not throw dice.*" At present the situation is clearly in favor for the indeterminists, the canonical position being expressed by Zeilinger [25], "*the discovery that individual events are irreducibly random is probably one of the most significant findings of the twentieth century. [...] for the individual event in quantum physics, not only do we not know the cause, there is no cause.*"

The last quarter of the twentieth century saw the rise of yet another form of physical indeterminism, originating in Poincaré's aforementioned discovery of instabilities of the motion of classical bodies [26, 27] against variations of initial conditions. This scenario of *deterministic chaos* resulted in a plethora of claims regarding indeterminism which resonated well in a general public susceptible to fables and fairy tales [28].

In parallel, Gödel's incompleteness theorems [29–33], as well as related findings in the computer sciences [34–37] put an end to Hilbert's program of finding a finite axiom system for all of mathematics, as well as established formal bounds on provability, predictability and induction.

Physical indeterminism can neither be proved, nor can there be given any reasonable criterion for its falsification. After all, how can one check against all laws and find none applicable? Unless one is willing to denote any system whose laws are currently unknown or whose behavior is hard to predict with present techniques as "indeterministic," there is no scientific substance to such absolute claims; in particular if one takes into account the bounds imposed by the theory of recursive functions discussed below. So, just as in the deterministic case, one is again inclined to accept this position as conjectural.

In discussing the present status of physical (in)determinism, we shall first consider provable

unknowables through reduction to incompleteness theorems of recursion theory, then discuss classical deterministic chaos, and finally deal with the three types of quantum indeterminism: the occurrence of certain single events, complementarity and value indefiniteness. The latter irreducible quantum unknowables are not commonly accepted by the entire community of physicists; a minority is still hoping for a more complete quantum theory than the present statistical theory.

## II. PROVABLE PHYSICAL UNKNOWABLES

In the past century, unknowability has been formally defined and *derived* in terms of a precise, formal notion of unprovability [29–31, 33, 34, 38–40]. This is a remarkable departure from informal suspicions and observations regarding the limitations of our worldview. No longer is one reduced to informal, heuristic contemplations and comparisons about what one knows and can do versus one’s unpredictability and incapability. Formal unknowability is about formal proofs of unpredictability and impossibility.

There are several “pathways” to formal undecidability. For contemporaries accustomed to computer programs (and their respective codes), a “short” and “straight” route may be algorithmic. What is an algorithm? In Turing’s own words [34],

*“whatever can (in principle) be calculated on a sheet of paper by the usual rules is computable.”*

From a purely syntactic point of view, formal systems in mathematics can be identified with computations and *vice versa*. Indeed, as stated by Gödel in a *Postscript*, dated from June 3rd, 1964 [41, pp. 369-370],

*“... due to A. M. Turing’s work, a precise and unquestionably adequate definition of the general concept of formal system can now be given, the existence of undecidable arithmetical propositions and the non-demonstrability of the consistency of a system in the same system can now be proved rigorously for every consistent formal system containing a certain amount of finitary number theory.*

*Turing’s work gives an analysis of the concept of “mechanical procedure” (alias “algorithm” or “computation procedure” or “finite combinatorial procedure”). This concept is shown to be equivalent with that of a “Turing machine.” A formal system*

*can simply be defined to be any mechanical procedure for producing formulas, called provable formulas.”*

Almost since its discovery, attempts [42, 43] have been made to translate formal incompleteness into the physics, mostly by reduction to some provable undecidable problem of recursion theory, such as the halting problem [44–55]. Here the term *reduction* indicates that physical undecidability is linked or reduced to logical undecidability. A typical example is the embedding of a Turing machine or any type of computer capable of universal computation into a physical system. As a consequence, the physical system inherits any type of unsolvability derivable for universal computers, such as the unsolvability of the halting problem derived below: since the computer is part of the physical system, so are its behavioral patterns (and *vice versa* [15, 56, 57]).

Note that these “logical and recursion theoretical” types of physical unknowables are only derivable within deterministic systems which are “strong enough” to express *self-reference* and *substitution* [33, Chapter 1]. Indeterministic systems are not deterministic *per se*. And “too weak” forms of expressibility are trivially “incomplete” in the sense that they are incapable of expressing self-reference and substitution.

Gödel himself did not believe that his incompleteness theorems had any relevance for physics, in particular not for quantum mechanics. The author was told by professor Wheeler that Gödel’s resentments (also mentioned in Ref. [58, pp. 140-141]) may have been due to Einstein’s negative opinion of quantum theory; to the extent that Einstein may have “brainwashed” Gödel into believing that all efforts in this direction were in vain.

#### **A. Intrinsic self-referential observers**

Embedded [59], intrinsic observers [60] cannot leave their “Cartesian prison” [1, Meditation 1,12] and “step outside” the universe examining it from some “Archimedean point” [61, § 11, pp.405-409]. Thus every physical observation is reflexive [62, 63] and circular [64]. The self-referential and substitution capability of observers results in very diverse, unpredictable forms of behavior, and in provable unknowables.

For the sake of the further analysis suppose that there exists observers measuring objects, and that observer and object are distinct from one another; separated by a “cut.” Through that cut, information is exchanged. Symbolically, we may regard the object as an agent contained in a “black box,” whose only relevant emanations are representable by finite strings of zeroes and ones

appearing on the cut, which can be modeled by any kind of screen or display. According to this purely syntactic point of view, a physical theory should be able to render identical symbols like the ones appearing through the cut. That is, a physical theory should be able to mimic or emulate the black box it purports to apply to. This view is often adapted in quantum mechanics [65], where the question regarding any “meaning” (e.g., Ref. [66, p. 129], see below) of the quantum formalism is notorious.

A sharp distinction between a physical object and an extrinsic, outside observer is a rarely affordable abstraction. Mostly the observer is part of the system to be observed. In such a case, the measurement process is modeled symmetrically, and information is exchanged between observer and object bidirectionally. This symmetrical configuration makes a distinction between observer and object purely conventional [67]. The cut is constituted by the information exchanged. We tend to associate with the “measurement apparatus” one of the two subsystems which in comparison is “larger” and “more classical” and “up-linked” with some conscious observer [68]. The rest of the system can then be called the “measured object.”

Intrinsic observers face all kinds of paradoxical self-referential situations. These have been known both informally as puzzling amusement and artistic perplexity, as well as a formalized scientifically valuable resource. The *liar paradox*, for instance, is already mentioned in the Bible’s Epistle to Titus, 1:12 stating that, “one of Crete’s own prophets has said it: ‘Cretans are always liars, evil brutes, lazy gluttons.’ He has surely told the truth.” In what follows, paradoxical self-referentiality will be applied to argue against the solvability of the general induction problem, as well as for a pandemonium of undecidabilities related to physical systems and their behaviors. All of them are based on intrinsic observers embedded in the system they observe.

It is not totally unreasonable to speculate that the limits of “intrinsic self-expression” seems to be what Gödel himself considered the gist of his incompleteness theorems. In a reply to a letter by Burks (reprinted in Ref. [69, p. 55]; see also Ref. [70, p.554]), Gödel states,

*“... that a complete epistemological description of a language A cannot be given in the same language A, because the concept of truth of sentences of A cannot be defined in A. It is this theorem which is the true reason for the existence of undecidable propositions in the formal systems containing arithmetic.”*

One of the first researchers getting interested in the application of paradoxical self-reference to physics was the philosopher Popper, who published two almost forgotten papers [42, 43] dis-

cussing, among other issues, Russell’s Paradox of Tristram Shandy [71]: In Volume 1, Chapter XIV, Shandy finds that he could publish two volumes of his life every year, covering a time span far smaller than the time it took him to write these volumes. This de-synchronization, Shandy concedes, will rather increase than diminish as he advances; and one may thus have serious doubts whether he will ever complete his autobiography. This relates to a question of whether there can be a physical computer that can be assured of correctly “*processing information faster than the universe does.*” Wolpert states that [72, p. 016128-1] (see also Ref. [73, § 5]), “*In a certain sense, the universe is more powerful than any information-processing system constructed within it could be. This result can alternatively be viewed as a restriction on the computational power of the universe—the universe cannot support the existence within it of a computer that can process information as fast as it can.*”

## **B. Unpredictability**

For any deterministic system “strong enough” to support universal computation, the general forecast or prediction problem is provable unsolvable. This proposition will be argued by reduction to the halting problem which is provable unsolvable. A straightforward embedding of a universal computer into a physical system results in the fact that, due to the reduction to the recursive undecidability of the halting problem, certain future events cannot be predicted and are thus provable indeterministic. Here reduction again means that physical undecidability is linked or reduced to logical undecidability.

A clear distinction should be made between *determinism* (such as *computable evolution laws*) and *predictability* [50]. Determinism is necessary for provable unpredictability; but determinism does not exclude unpredictability “in the long run.” Recursion theoretic unknowables correspond to “global” observables, whereas the “local” (temporal) “step-by-step” evolution of the system can be perfectly deterministic and computable.

Unpredictability in indeterministic systems is tautological and trivial. At the other extreme, one should also keep in mind that there exist rather straightforward “pre-Gödelian” impossibilities [74] to express certain mathematical truth in “weak” systems which are incapable to represent universal computation or Peano arithmetic.

For the sake of getting an (algorithmic) taste of what paradoxical self-reference is like, we present the sketch of a proof by contradiction of the unsolvability of the halting problem. The

halting problem is the decision problem whether or not a computer will eventually “halt” on a given input; i.e., will evolve into a state indicating the “completion” of a computation task, or stop altogether. Stated differently, a “solution” of the halting problem will be an algorithm which decides whether another arbitrary algorithm on arbitrary input “finishes running” or will “run forever.”

The scheme of the proof by contradiction is as follows: the existence of a hypothetical halting algorithm capable of solving the halting problem will be *assumed*. This could, for instance, be a “subprogram” of some suspicious “super-macro library” which takes the code of an arbitrary program as input and outputs “yes” or “no,” depending on whether or not the program halts. One may also think of it as a sort of “oracle” or “black box” taking in an arbitrary program in terms of its symbolic code, and outputting one of two symbolic states, say “yes” or “no,” referring to termination or nontermination of the input program, respectively.

Based on this “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” we construct another “*diagonalization program*” as follows: upon receiving some arbitrary “*input program*” code as input, the “*diagonalization program*” consults the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” whether or not this “*input program*” halts; and upon receiving some answer it does the *opposite*: if the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” decides that the “*input program*” halts, the “*diagonalization program*” does *not* halt (it may do so easily by entering an infinite loop). Alternatively, if the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” decides that the “*input program*” does *not* halt, the “*diagonalization program*” halts immediately.

The “*diagonalization program*” can be forced to execute a paradoxical task by receiving *its own program code* as “*input program*.” Because by considering the “*diagonalization program*,” the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” steers the “*diagonalization program*” into *halting* if it discovers that it *does not halt*; conversely, the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*” steers the “*diagonalization program*” into *not halting* if it discovers that it *halts*.

The contradiction obtained in applying the “*diagonalization program*” to its own code proves that this program, and in particular the “*hypothetical halting algorithm*,” cannot exist. A slightly revised form of the proof holds for quantum diagonalization [75], as quantum information could be in a fifty-fifty fixed point state.

A universal computer can in principle be embedded into, or realized by, certain physical systems designed to universally compute. An example for such a physical system is the computer on which I am currently typing this manuscript. Assuming unbounded space (i.e., memory [76])

and time, it follows by reduction [44–55, 73]. that there exist physical observables, in particular forecasts about whether or not an embedded computer will ever halt in the sense sketched above, which are provably undecidable.

### C. The busy beaver function as the maximal recurrence time

The busy beaver function [77–80] addresses the following question: suppose one considers all programs (on a particular computer) up to length (in terms of the number of symbols)  $n$ . What is the *largest number* producible by such a program before halting? (Note that non-halting programs, possibly producing an infinite number; e.g., by a non-terminating loop, do not apply.) This number may be called the *busy beaver function* of  $n$ . The first values of a certain universal computer’s busy beaver function with 2 states and  $n$  symbols are, for  $n = 2, 3, 4, 5, 7$  and  $8$ , known to be, or estimated by [79, 80] 4, 6, 13, greater than  $10^3$ , greater than  $10^4$ , and greater than  $10^{44}$ .

Consider a related question: what is the upper bound of running time — or, alternatively, recurrence time — of a program of length  $n$  bits before terminating, or, alternatively, recurring? An answer to that question confers a feeling of how long we have to wait for the most time-consuming program of length  $n$  bits to hold. That, of course, is a worst-case scenario. Many programs of length  $n$  bits will have halted long before the maximal halting time. We mention without proof [78, 81] that this bound can be represented by the busy beaver function.

Knowledge of the maximal halting time would “solve” the halting problem quantitatively; because if the maximal halting time would be known and bounded by any computable function of the program size of  $n$  bits, one would have to wait just a little bit longer than the maximal halting time to make sure that every program of length  $n$  — also this particular program, if it is destined for termination — would have terminated. Otherwise, the program would run forever. Since due to the recursive unsolvability of the halting problem the latter one does not exist, we may expect that the maximal halting time cannot be a computable function. Indeed, for large values of  $n$ , the maximal halting time “explodes” and grows faster than any computable function of  $n$ .

By reduction upper bounds for the recurrence of any kind of physical behavior can be obtained: for deterministic systems representable by  $n$  bits, the recurrence time grows faster than any computable number of  $n$ . This bound from below for possible behaviors may be interpreted quite generally as a “measure” of the impossibility to predict and forecast such behaviors by algorithmic means.

#### D. Undecidability of the induction problem

Induction in physics is the inference of general rules dominating and generating physical behaviors from these behaviors alone. For any deterministic system strong enough to support universal computation, the general induction problem is provably unsolvable. Induction is thereby reduced to the unsolvability of the rule inference problem [82–86] of identifying a rule or law reproducing the behavior of a deterministic system by observing its input/output performance by purely algorithmic means (not by intuition).

Informally, the algorithmic idea of the proof is to take any sufficiently powerful rule or method of induction and, by using it, to define some functional behavior which is not identified by it. This amounts to constructing an algorithm which (passively!) “fakes” the “guesser” by simulating some particular function until the guesser pretends to be able to guess this function correctly. In a second, diagonalization step, the “faking” algorithm then switches to a different function to invalidate the guesser’s guess.

One can also interpret this result in terms of the recursive unsolvability of the halting problem, which in turn is related to the busy beaver function: there is no recursive bound on the time the guesser has to wait in order to make sure that his guess is correct.

#### E. Impossibility

Physical tasks which would result in “paradoxical” behavior [87] are impossible to perform. One of these tasks is the solution of the general halting problem, as discussed above. Thus, omnipotence appears to be not feasible; at least as long one sticks to the usual formal rules abhorring inconsistencies [87, p. 163].

Another such paradoxical task can be “forced upon” *La Bocca della Verità* (in English, “the Mouth of Truth”), located in the *portico* of the church of *Santa Maria in Cosmedin* in Rome. It is often believed that if one told a lie with one’s hand in the mouth of the sculpture, it would be bitten off; another less violent legend has it that anyone sticking a hand in the mouth slot and then utters a false statement will never be able to pull the hand back out. Rucker once allegedly put in his hand uttering [88, p. 178] “*I will not be able to pull my hand back out.*” I leave it to the reader to imagine *La Bocca della Verità*’s confusion when confronted with such a statement!

There is a *pandemonium* of conceivable physical tasks [55], some quite entertaining [89], which

would result in paradoxical behavior and are thus impossible to perform. Some of these tasks are “pre-Gödelian” and merely require paradoxical *substitution* [33, pp. 2-4].

#### **F. Results in classical recursion theory with implications for theoretical physics**

The following theorems of recursive analysis [90, 91] have some implications to theoretical physics [92]. (i) There exist recursive monotone bounded sequences of rational numbers whose limit is no computable number [93]. A concrete example of such a number is Chaitin’s Omega number [35, 36, 94], the “halting probability” for a computer (using prefix-free code), which can be defined by a sequence of rational numbers with no computable rate of convergence. (ii) There exist a recursive real function which has its maximum in the unit interval at no recursive real number [95]. This has implication for the principle of least action. (iii) There exists a real number  $r$  such that  $G(r) = 0$  is recursively undecidable for  $G(x)$  in a class of functions which involves polynomials and the sine function [96]. This again has some bearing on the principle of least action. (iv) There exist incomputable solutions of the wave equations for computable initial values [97, 98]. (v) Based on theorems of recursive analysis [99, 100], many questions in dynamical systems theory are provable undecidable [101–103].

### **III. DETERMINISTIC CHAOS**

The wording “*deterministic chaos*” appears to be a *contradictio in adjecto* (in English, “a contradiction in itself”); indicating a “hybrid” form of “chaotic” behavior in deterministic systems [104, 105]. Operationally, it is characterized by the practical impossibility to forecast the future due to the fact that the system is unstable [106] and very sensitive with respect to very small variations of the initial state, which can only be measured with finite accuracy.

#### **A. Instabilities in classical motion**

In 1885 King Oscar II of Sweden and Norway, stimulated by Weierstrass, Hermite and Mittag-Leffler offered a prize to anybody contributing toward the solution of the so-called *n-body problem* [107]:

*“Given a system of arbitrarily many mass points that attract each according to Newton’s law, try to find, under the assumption that no two points ever collide, a representation of the coordinates of each point as a series in a variable that is some known function of time and for all of whose values the series converges uniformly.”*

The prize-winning work was expected to render systematic techniques toward a solution to *stable* motion, such that systems whose states start out “close together” will stay close together forever [27, p. 69]. To everyone’s surprise, the exciting course of events [27, 108, 109] resulted in Poincaré’s prize-winning centennial contribution [110] predicting unexpected and irreducible *instabilities* in the mechanical motion of bodies. Poincaré was lead to the conclusion that sometimes small variations in the initial state could lead to huge variations in the evolution of a physical system at later times. In Poincaré’s own words [26, Chapter 4, Sect. II, pp. 56-57]:

*“If we would know the laws of Nature and the state of the Universe precisely for a certain time, we would be able to predict with certainty the state of the Universe for any later time. But [[ ... ]] it can be the case that small differences in the initial values produce great differences in the later phenomena; a small error in the former may result in a large error in the latter. The prediction becomes impossible and we have a “random phenomenon.” ”*

Note that Poincaré adheres to a Laplacian-type determinism, but recognizes the possibility that systems whose states start out “close together” will stay close together *for a while* [27, p. 69] and then diverge into totally different behaviors. Today such behaviors are subsumed under the name “deterministic chaos.” In chaotic systems it is practically impossible to specify the initial value precise enough to allow long-term predictions.

Already in 1873, Maxwell had mentioned [111, pp. 211-212] that

*“... when an infinitely small variation in the present state may bring about a finite difference in the state of the system in a finite time, the condition of the system is said to be unstable. It is manifest that the existence of unstable conditions renders impossible the prediction of future events, if our knowledge of the present state is only approximate, and not accurate.”*

Maxwell also discussed unstable states of high potential energy whose spontaneous [3] “decay” or “change” “requires an expenditure of work, which in certain cases may be infinitesimally small, and in general bears no definite proportion to the energy developed in consequence thereof.”

Today, after more than a century of research into unstable “chaotic” motion, *symbolic dynamics* identified the Poincaré *map near a homocyclic orbit*, the *horseshoe map* [112], and the *shift map* as equivalent origins of classical deterministic “chaotic” motion, which is characterized by a *computable evolution law* and the sensitivity and instability of the behavior on the *initial value* [104, 105, 113].

This scenario can be demonstrated by considering the shift map  $\sigma$  which “pushes” up successive bits of the sequence  $s = 0.s_1s_2s_3\cdots$ ; i.e.,  $\sigma(s) = 0.s_2s_3s_4\cdots$ ,  $\sigma(\sigma(s)) = 0.s_3s_4s_5\cdots$ , and so on. Suppose one starts with an initial “measurement” precision of, say, two bits after the comma, indicated by a “window of measurability;” all other information “beyond the second bit after the comma” is hidden to the experimenter at this point. Consider two “operationally” identical initial states  $s = [0.s_1s_2]s_3\cdots$  and  $s' = [0.s_1s_2]s'_3\cdots$ , with  $s_3 \neq s'_3$ , and the square brackets “[  $\cdots$  ]” indicate the boundaries of the “window of measurability.” Initially,  $s$  and  $s'$  cannot be distinguished “operationally,” since both start with the same “window of measurability”  $0.s_1s_2$ . After just two iterations,  $s$  and  $s'$  may result in different, diverging “observables”  $\sigma(\sigma(s)) = [0.s_3s_4]s_5\cdots$  and  $\sigma(\sigma(s')) = [0.s'_3s'_4]s'_5\cdots$ .

If the initial values are *defined* to be elements of a continuum, then “almost all” (of measure one) of them are not representable by any algorithmically compressible number; in short, they are random [36, 114]. Classical, deterministic chaos results from the “unfolding” of such a random initial value — drawn somehow (one needs the *axiom of choice* [115, 116] for doing this) from the “continuum urn” — by a recursive, deterministic function. Of course, if one restricts the initial values to finite sets, or to, say, the rationals, then the behavior will be periodic. So, the randomness of classical, deterministic chaos resides in the *assumption of the continuum*; an assumption which might be considered a “convenience,” as it is difficult to conceive of any convincing physical “operational” evidence supporting the continuum assumption. If the continuum assumption is dropped then what remains is Maxwell’s and Poincaré’s observation of the unpredictability of the behavior of a deterministic system due to instabilities [106].

## B. Rate of convergence

The connections between symbolic dynamical systems and universal computation result in provable unknowables [102, 103]. These symbolic dynamic unknowables are different in type from the dynamical instabilities, and should be interpreted recursion theoretically, as outlined in

## Section II B.

Let us come back to the original  $n$ -body problem. About one hundred years after its formulation as quoted above, the  $n$ -body problem has been solved [109, 117–122]. The 3-body problem was already solved in 1912 [123]. The solutions are given in terms of convergent power series.

Yet, in order to be practically applicable, the rate of convergence of the series must be computable and even “reasonably good.” We might already expect from symbolic dynamics that these series solutions in general could converge “very slowly.” Even the prediction of behaviors in insignificantly short times may require the summation of a huge number of terms, making these series unusable for all practical purposes [109, 124].

Alas, the complications regarding convergence may be more serious. Consider a universal computer based on the  $n$ -body problem. This can, for instance, be achieved by ballistic computation, such as the “Billiard Ball” model of computation [125, 126] which effectively “embeds” a universal computer into a system of  $n$ -bodies [127]. It follows by reduction that certain predictions, say, related to encoding of the general halting problem, are impossible.

What are the consequences of this reduction for the convergence of the series solutions? It can be expected that not only do the series converge “very slowly,” like in deterministic chaos, but that in general there does not exist any computable rate of convergence for the series solutions of particular observables. This is very similar to the busy beaver function or to Chaitin’s Omega number [35, 36] representing the halting probability of a universal computer. The Omega number can be “enumerated” by series solutions from “quasi-algorithms” computing its very first digits [94]. Yet, due to the uncomputable growth of the time required to determine whether or not certain summation terms corresponding to halting programs possibly contribute, the series lack any computable rate of convergence.

While it may be possible to evaluate the state of the  $n$  bodies by Wang’s power series solution for any finite time with a computable rate of convergence, global observables, referring to (recursively) unbounded times, may be uncomputable. Examples of global observables correspond to solutions of certain decision problems, like for instance the stability of some solar system (we do not claim that this is provably uncomputable) or the halting problem.

This, of course, stems from the metaphor and robustness of universal computation and the capacity of the  $n$ -body problem to implement universality. It is no particularity and peculiarity of Wang’s power series solution. Indeed, the “troubles” reside in the capabilities to implement Peano arithmetic and universal computation by  $n$ -body problems. Because of this capacity, there

cannot exist other formalizable methods, analytic solutions or approximations capable to decide and compute certain decision problems or observables for the  $n$ -body problem.

#### IV. QUANTUM UNKNOWABLES

After discussing provable physical unknowables by reduction to recursion theoretical ones, and “chaotic” symbolic dynamics systems, a third group of physical unknowables arises in the quantum domain. Although it has turned out to be a highly successful theory, quantum mechanics, in particular its interpretation and meaning, has been controversially received within the physics community. Some of its founding fathers, like Schrödinger and in particular Einstein, considered quantum mechanics to be an unsatisfactory theory: Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen argued [22, 23] that there exist ways to counterfactually [128, 129] infer observables from experiment which, according to quantum mechanics, cannot co-exist simultaneously; hence quantum mechanics cannot predict what experiment can (counterfactually) “measure;” thus quantum mechanics is *incomplete* and should eventually be substituted by a more complete theory. Others, among them Born, Bohr and Heisenberg, claimed that quantum unknowables are irreducible, “ontic,” and will stay with us forever. Over the years, the latter view seems to have prevailed [65, 130]; although not totally unchallenged [131–133]. Already Sommerfeld warned his students not to get into the “meaning behind” quantum mechanics, and, as mentioned by Clauser [134], not long ago scientists working in that field had to be very careful not to become discredited as “*quacks*.” Richard Feynman [66, p. 129] once mentioned the

*“... perpetual torment that results from [[the question]], ‘But how can it be like that?’ which is a reflection of uncontrolled but utterly vain desire to see [[quantum mechanics]] in terms of an analogy with something familiar ... Do not keep saying to yourself, if you can possibly avoid it, ‘But how can it be like that?’ because you will get ‘down the drain’, into a blind alley from which nobody has yet escaped.”*

This anti-rationalistic postulate of irreducible indeterminism and “meaninglessness” came after a period of fierce debate on the quantum foundations, after decades of vain attempts to “complete” quantum mechanics in any operationally testable way, and after the discovery of mathematical “proofs” of the incompatibility of local, realistic, context-independent ways to “complete” quantum mechanics [135, 136].

In what follows, we shall discuss three main quantum unknowables: (i) randomness of single events, (ii) complementarity, and (iii) value indefiniteness.

#### **A. Random events**

In 1926, Born postulated that (cf. Ref. [137, p. 866], English translation in Ref. [138, p. 54])

*“From the standpoint of our quantum mechanics, there is no quantity which in any individual case causally fixes the consequence of the collision; but also experimentally we have so far no reason to believe that there are some inner properties of the atom which condition a definite outcome for the collision. Ought we to hope later to discover such properties [...] and determine them in individual cases? Or ought we to believe that the agreement of theory and experiment — as to the impossibility of prescribing conditions? I myself am inclined to give up determinism in the world of atoms.”*

Furthermore, Born suggested that, while *individual particles behave irreducibly indeterministic*, the *quantum state evolves deterministically* (even reversible; i.e., one-to-one) in a “Laplacian” causal way (cf. Ref. [139, p. 804], English translation in Ref. [140, p. 302]):

*“The motion of particles conforms to the laws of probability, but the probability itself is propagated in accordance with the law of causality. [This means that knowledge of a state in all points in a given time determines the distribution of the state at all later times.]”*

This distinction between a reversible, deterministic evolution of the quantum state on the one hand, and the irreversible measurement on the other hand, has left some physicists with an “uneasy feeling;” in particular in view of the possibility to “erase” [141, 142] measurements by completely reconstructing the quantum state. Also, it is not entirely clear, and indeed remains conventional [67] where exactly the “measurement cut” [68, 143] between the observer and the object is located: By assuming the universal applicability of quantum mechanics, the object and the measurement apparatus could be uniformly *combined* into a “larger system” whose quantum mechanical evolution should be deterministic; otherwise one would have to assume that quantum mechanics is not universally valid [144, p. 454]. Of course, this could result in the “superposition”

of classically contradictory quantum states; with the associated Schrödinger’s cat type representation paradox [145, 812]. Indeed, in Schrödinger’s words [146, pp. 19-20],

*“[[...]] The idea that [[the alternate measurement outcomes]] be not alternatives but all really happening simultaneously seems lunatic to him, just impossible. He thinks that if the laws of nature took this form for, let me say, a quarter of an hour, we should find our surroundings rapidly turning into a quagmire, a sort of a featureless jelly or plasma, all contours becoming blurred, we ourselves probably becoming jelly fish. It is strange that he should believe this. For I understand he grants that unobserved nature does behave this way—namely according to the wave equation. [[...]] according to the quantum theorist, nature is prevented from rapid jellification only by our perceiving or observing it.”*

Yet, pointedly stated, if, at least in principle there is no such thing as an “irreversible measurement,” why should there be an “indeterministic individual event?”

Born did not address these questions, nor did he specify the formal notion of “indeterminism” he was relating to. So far, no mathematical characterization of quantum randomness has been proved [147]. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, it is mostly implicitly assumed that quantum randomness is of the strongest possible kind; which amounts to postulating that the symbolic sequences associated with measurement outcomes are uncomputable [147], or even algorithmically incompressible.

Indeed, the quantum formalism does not predict the outcome of single events when there is a mismatch between the context in which a state was prepared, and the context in which it is measured. Here, the term “context” [128, 148] denotes a maximal collection of co-measurable observables, or, more technically, the maximal operator from which all commuting operators can be functionally derived [149, §84]. Ideally, a quantized system can be prepared to yield exactly one answer in exactly one context [150–152]. Other outcomes associated with other contexts occur indeterministically [147].

Furthermore, the quantum formalism is incapable of predicting deterministically the radioactive decay of individual particles. Attempts to find causal laws “dried out” [19, 20] at the time of Born’s suggestion of the indeterministic interpretation of individual measurement outcomes, and nobody has come up with a satisfactory answer since then.

In the absence of other explanations, it might thus be consistent with the present prevalent opinion among physicists that these single events occur without any causation and thus at random. Such random “quantum coin tosses” [153–160] have been used for various purposes, among them delayed choice experiments [155, 161].

Note that randomness of this type [162, 163] is postulated rather than proved; and thus, unless disproved, remains conjectural. This is necessarily so, for any claim of randomness can only be corroborated *relative to*, and *with respect to*, a more or less large class of laws or behaviors; it is impossible to inspect the hypothesis against an infinity of — and even less so all — conceivable laws. To rephrase a statement about computability [31, p. 11], “*how can we ever exclude the possibility of our presented, some day (perhaps by some extraterrestrial visitors), with a (perhaps extremely complex) device that “computes” and “predicts” a certain type of hitherto “random” physical behavior?*”

## **B. Complementarity**

Complementarity is the impossibility to measure two or more complementary observables with arbitrary precision simultaneously.

In 1933, Pauli gave the first explicit definition of complementarity stating that (cf. [164, p. 7], partial English translation in [140, p. 369])

*“In the case of an indeterminacy of a property of a system at a certain configuration (at a certain state of a system), any attempt to measure the respective property (at least partially) annihilates the influence of the previous knowledge of system on the (possibly statistical) propositions about possible later measurement results. [...] The impact on the system by the measurement apparatus for momentum (position) is such that within the limits of the uncertainty relations the value of the knowledge of the previous position (momentum) for the prediction of later measurements of position and momentum is lost.”*

Einstein-Podolski-Rosen [22] type arguments utilizing a configuration of two “entangled” particles [145, 165, 166] claim to be able to infer two different contexts counterfactually simultaneously, thus circumventing complementarity. Thereby, one context is measured on one side of the setup, whereas the other context on the other side of it. By the uniqueness property [167] of

certain two-particle states, knowledge of a property of one particle entails the certainty that, if this property were measured on the other particle as well, the outcome of the measurement would be a unique function of the outcome of the measurement performed.

This makes possible the measurement of one context, *as well as the simultaneous counterfactual inference* of a different context. Because, one could argue, although one has actually measured on one side a different, incompatible context compared to the context measured on the other side, if on both sides the same context *would be measured*, the outcomes on both sides *would be uniquely correlated*. Hence, concludes the Einstein-Podolski-Rosen type argument, measurement of one context per side is sufficient, for the outcome could be counterfactually inferred on the other side. In the opinion of these authors, quantum mechanics is “incomplete,” because it cannot predict what can be measured; thus a “more complete” theory is needed.

Complementarity was first encountered in quantum mechanics, but it is a phenomenon also observable in the classical world. To get a better intuition for complementarity, we shall consider generalized urn models [168, 169] or, equivalently [170], finite deterministic automata [171–174] in an unknown initial state. Both quasi-classic examples mimic complementarity to the extent that even quasi-quantum cryptography can be performed with them [175].

A generalized urn model is characterized by an ensemble of balls with black background color. Printed on these balls are some color symbols. Every ball contains just one single symbol per color.

Assume further some filters or eyeglasses which are “perfect” by totally absorbing light of all other colors but a particular single one. In that way, every color can be associated with a particular eyeglass and vice versa.

When a spectator looks at a particular ball through such an eyeglass, the only operationally recognizable symbol will be the one in the particular color which is transmitted through the eyeglass. All other colors are absorbed, and the symbols printed in them will appear black and therefore cannot be differentiated from the black background. Hence the ball appears to carry a different “message” or symbol, depending on the color at which it is viewed.

The difference between the balls and the quanta is the possibility to view all the different symbols on the balls in all different colors by taking off the eyeglasses; also one can consecutively look at one and the same ball with different colors, thereby identifying the ball completely. Quantum mechanics does not provide us with a possibility to “look across the quantum veil,” as it neither allows a “global, simultaneous measurement” of all complementary observables, nor does it allow

a measurement of one observable without disturbing the measurement of another complimentary observable (with the exception of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type “counterfactual measurements”). On the contrary, there are strong formal arguments suggesting that the assumption of a simultaneous physical existence of such complementary observables yields a complete contradiction. These issues will be discussed next.

### C. Value indefiniteness versus omniscience

Still another quantum unknowable results from the fact that no “global” classical truth assignment exists which is consistent with even a finite number of “local” ones. That is, no consistent classical truth table can be given by pasting together co-measurable observables. This phenomenon is also known as *value indefiniteness* or, by an option to interpret this result, *contextuality* (see below). Here the term “local” refers to a particular context [148], which operationally should be thought of the collection of all co-measurable or co-preparable [150] observables. The structure of quantum propositions [176–182] can be obtained by “pasting” contexts together.

As by definition only *one single* such context is directly measurable, arguments based on more than one contexts must necessarily involve counterfactuals [128, 129]. A *counterfactual* is an “observable” which has not been measured but “potentially” could have been measured if an observer “would have” decided to do so; alas the observer decided to measure a different, presumably complementary, observable. Already scholastic philosophy [183], for instance Thomas Aquinas, considered similar questions such as whether God has knowledge of non-existing things [184, Part 1, Question 14, Article 9] or things that are not yet [184, Part 1, Question 14, Article 13]. Classical omniscience, at least its naive expression that “if a proposition is true, then an omniscient agent (such as God) knows that it is true” is plagued by controversies and paradoxes. Even without evoking quantum mechanics, there exist bounds on behaviors due to the self-referential perception of intrinsic observers endowed with free will: if such an observer is omniscient and has absolute predictive power, then free will could counteract omniscience, and in particular the own predictions. Within a consistent formal framework, the only alternative seems either to abandon free will, stating that it is an idealistic illusion, or to accept that omniscience and absolute predictive power is bound by paradoxical self-reference.

The empirical sciences implement classical omniscience by assuming that in principle all observables of classical physics are (co-)measurable without any restrictions, and regardless of

whether they are actually measured or not. No ontological distinction is made between an observable obtained by an “actual” and a “potential” or “counterfactual” measurement. (In contrast compare Schrödinger’s own epistemological interpretation of the wave function [145, §7] as a “*catalog of expectations*.”) Precision and co-measurability are limited only by the technical capacities of the experimenter. The principle of empirical classical omniscience has given rise to the realistic belief that all observables “exist” regardless of their observation; i.e., regardless and independent of any particular measurement. Physical (co-)existence is thereby related to the realistic assumption [185] (sometimes referred to as the “ontic” [186] viewpoint) that such physical entities exist even without being experienced by any finite mind.

The formal expression of classical omniscience is the Boolean algebra of observable propositions [187], and in particular the “abundance” of two-valued states interpretable as omniscience about the system. Thereby, any such “dispersionless” quasi-classical two-valued state — associated with a “truth table” — can be defined on all observables, regardless of whether they have been actually observed or not.

After the discovery of complementarity, a further indication against quantum omniscience came from Boole’s “conditions of possible experience” [188, 189] for quantum probabilities and expectation functions. Bell pointed out that experiments based on counterfactually inferred “observables” discussed by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [22], violate these “conditions of possible experience,” and thus seem to indicate the impossibility to faithfully embed quantum observables into classical Boolean algebras. Stated pointedly, under some (presumably mild) side assumptions, “*unperformed experiments have no results*” [190]; i.e., there cannot exist a table enumerating all actual and hypothetical context independent experimental outcomes consistent with the observed quantum frequencies [191, 192]. As any such table could be interpreted as omniscience with respect to the observables in the Boole-Bell-Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type experiments, the impossibility to consistently enumerate such tables (under the noncontextual assumption) appears to be a very serious indication against omniscience in the quantum domain.

The quantum nonlocal (i.e., the particles are spatially separated) correlations among observables in the Boole-Bell-Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type experiments are “stronger-than-classical” in the sense that, if *ex post facto* the two outcomes are compared, in the case of dichotomic observables, say “+” and “−,” for some measurement parameter regions, there appear to be *more equal* occurrences “++” or “−−” and thus *less unequal* occurrences “+−” or “−+” than could be classically accounted for; likewise, for other parameter regions, there appear to be *less equal*

occurrences “++” or “--” and thus *more unequal* occurrences “+-” or “-+” than could be classically accounted for. Since these conclusions can only be drawn *after* bringing together and comparing the outcomes, individual outcomes occur indeterministically, and in particular independent of the setting (but not of outcomes [193]) of other, distant, measurements, no faster-than-light signalling can occur; indeed even “stronger-than-quantum” correlations would, in this regime, not violate relativistic causality [194–197].

The reason for the impossibility to describe all quantum observables simultaneously by classical tables of experimental outcomes can be understood in terms of a “stronger” result stating that, for quantum systems whose Hilbert space is of dimension greater than two, there does not exist any “dispersionless” quasi-classical, two-valued state interpretable as truth table. This result, which is known as the Kochen-Specker theorem [136, 148, 182, 183, 198–205], has a finitistic proof by contradiction. Proofs of the Kochen-Specker theorem amount to “brain teasers” in graph coloring: show that no coloring of certain sets of points (representing quantum observables) in Kochen-Specker- or Greechie orthogonality diagrams exists which include only a single red point per smooth, unbroken curve; all other points should be colored green. Alternatively, there does not exist a single possibility to consistently and context-independently enumerate and tabulate the values of all the observables occurring in a Kochen-Specker type argument [192, 205]. Any “forced” tabulation would result in a context dependence; i.e., the outcome of a measurement of an observable would depend on what other co-measurable observables are measured alongside of it [148, 206–209]. As far as Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen type measurements might reproduce such contextual behavior, quantum mechanics predicts non-contextuality [210].

The violations of conditions of possible classical experience or the Kochen-Specker theorem do not exclude realism restricted to a single context, but realistic omniscience beyond it. It may not be totally unreasonable to suspect that the assumption of (pre-)determined observables “outside” of a single context may be unjustified [211]. Nevertheless, the current “mainstream” interpretation of the Kochen-Specker theorem is in terms of quantum contextuality; i.e., by assuming a dependence of the outcome of a single observable on what other observables are actually measured, or could have been in principle measured, alongside of it.

## V. MIRACLES DUE TO GAPS IN CAUSAL DESCRIPTION

A different issue, discussed by Philipp Frank [3], is the possible occurrence of miracles in the presence of *gaps* of physical determinism. Already Maxwell considered *singular points* [111, pp. 212-213], “*where prediction, except from absolutely perfect data, and guided by the omniscience of contingency, becomes impossible.*” One might perceive individual events occurring “outside” of the validity of classical and quantum physics without any apparent cause as miracles. For, if there is no cause to an event, why should such an event occur altogether rather than not occur?

Although such thoughts remain highly speculative, miracles, if they exist, could be the basis for an “operator-directed” evolution in otherwise deterministic physical systems. Similar models have been applied to dualistic models of the mind [212, 213]. The objection that this scenario is unnecessarily complicating an otherwise “monistic” model should be carefully re-evaluated in view of computer-generated *virtual realities* [1, 214, 215]. In such “algorithmic universes,” there are computable evolution laws, as well as “inputs” from “interfaces.” From the intrinsic perspective [60], the inputs cannot be causally accounted for; hence they remain irreducibly “transcendental” with respect to the “algorithmic universe.”

## VI. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

### A. Metaphysical status of (in)determinism

Hilbert’s sixth problem [13] is about the axiomatization of physics. Regardless of whether or not this goal is achievable, omniscience cannot be gained via the formalized, syntactic route to infer and predict physical behaviors. It will remain blocked forever by paradoxical self-reference which intrinsic observers and operational methods are bound to. Even if the universe would be a computer [216–219], we would “intrinsically experience” unpredictability and complementarity.

With regards to conjectures about the (in)deterministic evolution of physical events, the situation is unsettled; and can be expected to remain unsettled forever. The reason for this situation is the provable impossibility to formally prove (in)determinism: neither is it possible to assure that physical behaviors are causal and will remain so forever, nor is it possible to exclude all causal behaviors.

The postulate of indeterministic behavior in physics or elsewhere is impossible to *prove* by

considering a finite operationally obtained encoded phenotype, such as a finite sequence of (supposedly random) bits from physical experiments, alone. Furthermore, recursion theory and algorithmic information theory [35–37] imply that an “unbounded” system of axioms is required to “prove” the “unbounded” algorithmic information content of an “unbounded” symbolic sequence; and there exist irreducible complexities even in pure mathematics [220, 221].

The opportunistic approach that, as historically many “ingenious scientists” failed to come up with a causal description, indeterminism will prevail, appears to be anecdotal at best and misleading at worst. Likewise, the advices of authoritative researchers to avoid asking questions related to “completing” a theory, or to avoid thinking about the “meaning” of any kind of “rational interpretation,” and to avoid searching for causal laws for phenomena which are, at the same time, postulated to occur indeterministically by that same authorities — even wisely and benevolently posted — hardly qualify as proofs.

Any kind of “lawlessness” can thus be claimed only *with reference to*, and *relative to* certain criteria, laws or quantitative statistical or algorithmic tests. For instance, randomness could be established merely *with respect to* certain tests, such as some “batteries” of tests of randomness, for instance, *diehard* [222], *NIST* [223], *TestU01* [224], or algorithmic [163, 225] tests. Note, however, that even the decimal expansion of  $\pi$ , the ratio between the circumference and the diameter of an ideal circle [226, 227], behaves “reasonably random” [225];  $\pi$  might even be a “good source” of “randomness” for many Monte Carlo calculations.

Thus, both from a formal as well as from operational point of view, any rational investigation into, or claim of, absolute (in)determinism is metaphysical and can only be proved *relative to* a limited number of statistical or algorithmic tests which some specialists “happen to choose;” with very limited validity for the formal and the natural sciences.

## **B. Harnessing unknowables and indeterminism**

Physical indeterminism need not necessarily be perceived negatively as the “absence” of causal laws, but rather as a *valuable resource*.

Indeed, ingenious “quasi-programs” to “compute” the *halting probability* [35, 94, 228] through summation of series without any computable rate of convergence could, at least in principle and “in the limit” of unbounded computational resources, be interpreted as “generating” provable random sequences. However, as has already been expressed by John von Neumann [229, p. 768], “Anyone

*who considers arithmetical methods of producing random digits is, of course, in a state of sin.”*

Besides recursion theoretic undecidability, there appear to be at least two principal sources of indeterminism and randomness in physics: (i) one scenario is associated with instabilities of classical physical systems, and with a strong dependence of future behaviors on the initial value; (ii) quantum indeterminism, which can be subdivided into three subcategories: random outcomes of individual events, complementarity, and value indefiniteness.

The production of “random numbers” by physical generators has a long history [230]. The similarities and differences between classical and quantum randomness can probably be best conceptualized in terms of two “black boxes;” the first one of them — called the “*Poincaré box*” — containing a classical, deterministic chaotic, source of randomness; the second — called the “*Born box*” — containing a quantum source of randomness.

A “*Poincaré box*” could be realized by operating a classical dynamical system in the “shift map” region. Major principles for “*Born boxes*” utilizing beam splitters [153–160] should be: (i) at least three mutually exclusive outcomes to assure value indefiniteness [160, 231], (ii) the states prepared and measured should be pure and in mutually (possibly interlinked [210]) unbiased bases or contexts, (iii) events should be “independent,” as to be able to apply proper normalization procedures [229, 232].

Suppose an agent is being presented with both boxes without any label on, or hint about, them; i.e., the origin of indeterminism is unknown to the agent. In a modified Turing test, an agent’s task would be to find out which is the Born and which is the Poincaré box by solely observing their output. In the absence of any criterion, there should not exist any operational method or procedure capable to discriminate among these boxes. Moreover, both types of indeterminism appear to be based on speculative assumptions: in the classical case it is the existence of continua and the possibility to “choose” elements thereof, representing the initial values; in the quantum case it is the irreducible indeterminism of single events.

### **C. Personal remarks**

It is perpetually amazing, perplexing and mind-boggling “how many” laws and formalized expressions can be found to express and “program” or “induce” physical behavior with “high precision.” So, there definitely is substance to the Pythagorean belief that, at least in a restricted manner, “nature is numbers” and “God computes;” maybe also “throwing dice” sometimes. The

apparent impossibilities to “explain” certain phenomena by any causal law should be perceived carefully and cautiously. The author has the impression that, in their attempts to canonize beliefs in the irreducible randomness in (quantum) mechanics, many physicists, philosophers and communicators may have prematurely “thrown a thorough rationalistic world view out with the provably unfounded claims of total omniscience and omnipotence.” Whether or not this feeling is justified, future will tell the generations to come.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges discussions with Cristian S. Calude, Norbert Brunner, Alexander Leitsch, Matthias Baaz, Anton Zeilinger, Günther Krenn, Johann Summhammer, Hans Havlicek, Klaus Ehrenberger, John Archibald Wheeler, Josef Tkadlec, Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Sylvia Pulmannová, Mirko Navara, Pavel Pták, Ernst Specker, David Mermin, Daniel Greenberger, Gregory Chaitin, Werner DePauli Schimanovich, Eckehart Köhler, Michael J. Dinneen, Elena Calude, Robert K. Clifton, John Casti, Gudrun Kalmbach, Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac and, last but not least, Ron Wright. None of them should be blamed for the author’s ignorance.

- 
- [1] Rene Descartes, *Meditation on First Philosophy* (1641) <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/cartes/meditations/meditations.html>.
  - [2] Sigmund Freud, “Ratschläge für den Arzt bei der psychoanalytischen Behandlung,” in *Gesammelte Werke. Chronologisch geordnet. Achter Band. Werke aus den Jahren 1909–1913*, edited by Anna Freud, E. Bibring, W. Hoffer, E. Kris, and O. Isakower (Fischer, Frankfurt am Main, 1999) pp. 376–387.
  - [3] Philipp Frank, *Das Kausalgesetz und seine Grenzen* (Springer, Vienna, 1932) English translation in Ref. [233].
  - [4] John D. Barrow, *Theories of Everything* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991).
  - [5] Helge Kragh, *Quantum generations: a history of physics in the twentieth century* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1999) ISBN 0-691-01206-7.
  - [6] R. Sherr, K. T. Bainbridge, and H. H. Anderson, “Transmutation of mercury by fast neutrons,” *Physical Review* **60**, 473–479 (Oct 1941), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.60.473>.

- [7] Rene Descartes, *Discours de la méthode pour bien conduire sa raison et chercher la verité dans les sciences (Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting One's Reason and of Seeking Truth)* (1637) <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/59>.
- [8] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* (1690) <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/10615> and <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/10616>.
- [9] David Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/9662>.
- [10] Pierre-Simon Laplace, *Philosophical Essay on Probabilities. Translated from the fifth French edition of 1825* (Springer, Berlin, New York, 1995, 1998) ISBN 978-0-387-94349-7, <http://www.archive.org/details/philosophicaless00lapliala>.
- [11] Heinrich Hertz, *Prinzipien der Mechanik* (Barth, Leipzig, 1894).
- [12] Eugene P. Wigner, "The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. Richard Courant Lecture delivered at New York University, May 11, 1959," *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **13**, 1–14 (1960), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cpa.3160130102>.
- [13] David Hilbert, "Mathematical problems," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **8**, 437–479 (1902), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1902-00923-3>.
- [14] Karl Raimund Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (Basic Books, New York, 1959).
- [15] Percy W. Bridgman, "A physicist's second reaction to Mengenlehre," *Scripta Mathematica* **2**, 101–117, 224–234 (1934), cf. R. Landauer [234].
- [16] George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710) <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/4723>.
- [17] Imre Lakatos, *Philosophical Papers. 1. The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978).
- [18] Robert D. Purrington, *Physics in the nineteenth century* (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 1997).
- [19] Helge Kragh, "The origin of radioactivity: from solvable problem to unsolved non-problem," *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* **50**, 331–358 (1997), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00374597>.
- [20] Helge Kragh, "Subatomic determinism and causal models of radioactive decay, 1903-1923," (November 2009), rePoSS: Research Publications on Science Studies 5. Department of Science Studies, University of Aarhus.

- [21] Max Born, “Ist die klassische Mechanik tatsächlich deterministisch?” *Physikalische Blätter* **11**, 49–54 (1955), English translation “Is classical mechanics in fact deterministic?” Reprinted in Ref. [24, p. 78-83].
- [22] Albert Einstein, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen, “Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?” *Physical Review* **47**, 777–780 (May 1935), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.47.777>.
- [23] Albert Einstein, “Reply to criticism: Remarks concerning the essays brought together in this cooperative volume,” in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist (New York: Library of Living Philosophers, 1949)*, on p. 668., edited by P. A. Schilpp (Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, NY, 1938) pp. 665–688.
- [24] Max Born, *Physics in my generation*, 2nd ed. (Springer Verlag, New York, 1969).
- [25] Anton Zeilinger, “The message of the quantum,” *Nature* **438**, 743 (2005), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/438743a>.
- [26] Henri Poincaré, *Wissenschaft und Hypothese* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1914).
- [27] Florin Diacu and Philip Holmes, *Celestial Encounters - the Origins of Chaos and Stability* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996).
- [28] Jean Bricmont, “Science of chaos or chaos in science?” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **775**, 131–175 (1996), [chao-dyn/9603009](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1996.tb23135.x), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1996.tb23135.x>.
- [29] Kurt Gödel, “Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme,” *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* **38**, 173–198 (1931), English translation in Ref. [41], and in Ref. [32].
- [30] A. Tarski, “Der Wahrheitsbegriff in den Sprachen der deduktiven Disziplinen,” *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse, Anzeiger* **69**, 24 (1932).
- [31] Martin Davis, *Computability and Unsolvability* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1958).
- [32] Martin Davis, *The Undecidable. Basic Papers on Undecidable, Unsolvable Problems and Computable Functions* (Raven Press, Hewlett, N.Y., 1965)

KEY: davis

ANNOTATION: This nation, turning 100 years old, had no *Odyssey*, no St. George slaying the dragon, no Prometheus. The emerging American genius for making a lot of money

was a poor substitute for King Arthur and his knights (although the Horatio Alger myth of rags to riches was good for a lot of mileage). Without a mythology and set of ancient heroes to call its own, America had to manufacture its heroes. So the mythmaking machinery of nineteenth—century American media created a suitable heroic archetype in the cowboys of the Wild West. The image was of the undaunted cattle drivers living a life of reckless individualism, braving the elements, staving off brutal Indian attacks. Or of heroic lawmen dueling with six—guns in the streets at high noon. This artificial Wild West became America’s Iliad.

- [33] Raymond M. Smullyan, *Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems* (Oxford University Press, New York, New York, 1992).
- [34] A. M. Turing, “On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem,” *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2 **42**, **43**, 230–265, 544–546 (1936-7 and 1937), reprinted in Ref. [32].
- [35] Gregory J. Chaitin, *Algorithmic Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987) <http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~chaitin/cup.pdf>.
- [36] Cristian Calude, *Information and Randomness—An Algorithmic Perspective*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2002).
- [37] Peter D. Grünwald and Paul M. B. Vitányi, “Algorithmic information theory,” in *Handbook of the Philosophy of Information*, edited by Pieter Adriaans and Johan F.A.K. van Benthem (Freeman, New York, NY, 1987) pp. 281–320, a volume in the *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science*, ed. by Dov Gabbay, Paul Thagard, and John Wood, arXiv:0809.2754, <http://homepages.cwi.nl/~paulv/papers/handbooklogic07.pdf>.
- [38] A. Tarski, *Logic, Semantics and Metamathematics* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1956).
- [39] Hartley Rogers, Jr., *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability* (MacGraw-Hill, New York, 1967).
- [40] Piergiorgio Odifreddi, *Classical Recursion Theory, Vol. 1* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989).
- [41] Kurt Gödel, in *Collected Works. Publications 1929-1936. Volume I*, edited by S. Feferman, J. W. Dawson, S. C. Kleene, G. H. Moore, R. M. Solovay, and J. van Heijenoort (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986).

- [42] Karl Raimund Popper, “Indeterminism in quantum physics and in classical physics I,” *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **1**, 117–133 (1950), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjps/I.2.117>.
- [43] Karl Raimund Popper, “Indeterminism in quantum physics and in classical physics II,” *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **1**, 173–195 (1950), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjps/I.3.173>.
- [44] Stephen Wolfram, “Computation theory of cellular automata,” *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **96**, 15–57 (1984), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01217347>.
- [45] I. Kanter, “Undecidability principle and the uncertainty principle even for classical systems,” *Physical Review Letters* **64**, 332–335 (1990), <http://link.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v64/p332>.
- [46] Christopher D. Moore, “Unpredictability and undecidability in dynamical systems,” *Physical Review Letters* **64**, 2354–2357 (1990), cf. Ch. Bennett, *Nature*, **346**, 606 (1990), <http://link.aps.org/abstract/PRL/v64/p2354>.
- [47] Stephan Wolfram, “Undecidability and intractability in theoretical physics,” *Physical Review Letters* **54**, 735–738 (Feb 1985), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.54.7357>.
- [48] N. C. A. da Costa and F. A. Doria, “Classical physics and Penrose’s thesis,” *Foundations of Physics Letters* **4**, 363–373 (Aug. 1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00671484>.
- [49] N. C. A. da Costa and F. A. Doria, “Undecidability and incompleteness in classical mechanics,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **30**, 1041–1073 (Aug. 1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00665895>.
- [50] Patrick Suppes, “The transcendental character of determinism,” *Midwest Studies In Philosophy* **18**, 242–257 (1993), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4975.1993.tb00266.x>.
- [51] Karl Svozil, *Randomness & Undecidability in Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
- [52] Arne Hole, “Predictability in deterministic theories,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **33**, 1085–1111 (May 1994), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01882755>.
- [53] John L. Casti and J. F. Traub, *On Limits* (Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM, 1994) report 94-10-056, <http://www.santafe.edu/research/publications/workingpapers/94-10-056.pdf>.
- [54] J. L. Casti and A. Karlquist, *Boundaries and Barriers. On the Limits to Scientific Knowledge* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1996).
- [55] John D. Barrow, *Impossibility. The limits of science and the science of limits* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998).

- [56] Rolf Landauer, “Computation and physics: Wheeler’s meaning circuit?,” *Foundations of Physics* **16**, 551–564 (1986), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01886520>.
- [57] Rolf Landauer, “Information is physical,” *Physics Today* **44**, 23–29 (May 1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.881299>.
- [58] J. Bernstein, *Quantum Profiles* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1991).
- [59] T. Toffoli, “The role of the observer in uniform systems,” in *Applied General Systems Research, Recent Developments and Trends*, edited by George J. Klir (Plenum Press, New York, London, 1978) pp. 395–400.
- [60] Karl Svozil, “Extrinsic-intrinsic concept and complementarity,” in *Inside versus Outside*, edited by H. Atmanspacher and G. J. Dalenoort (Springer, Heidelberg, 1994) pp. 273–288, <http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil/publ/1994-exin.pdf>.
- [61] Rudjer Josif Boskovich, “De spacio et tempore, ut a nobis cognoscuntur,” in *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, edited by J. M. Child (Open Court (1922) and MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1966) pp. 203–205, <http://www.archive.org/details/theoryofnaturalp00boscrich>.
- [62] Thomas Nagel, *The View from Nowhere* (Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, 1986).
- [63] Ernest Sosa, *Reflective Knowledge. Apt Belief and Reflective Knowledge, Volume II* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2009).
- [64] Louis H. Kauffman, “Self-reference and recursive forms,” *Journal of Social and Biological Structures* **10**, 53 – 72 (1987), ISSN 0140-1750, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-1750\(87\)90034-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-1750(87)90034-0).
- [65] Christopher A. Fuchs and Asher Peres, “Quantum theory needs no ‘interpretation,”” *Physics Today* **53**, 70–71 (March 2000), further discussions of and reactions to the article can be found in the September issue of *Physics Today*, 53, 11-14 (2000), <http://www.aip.org/web2/aiphome/pt/vol-53/iss-9/p11.html> and <http://www.aip.org/web2/aiphome/pt/vol-53/iss-9/p14.html>.
- [66] Richard Phillips Feynman, *The Character of Physical Law* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1965).
- [67] Karl Svozil, “Conventions in relativity theory and quantum mechanics,” *Foundations of Physics* **32**, 479–502 (2002), quant-ph/0110054, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015017831247>.
- [68] Eugene P. Wigner, “Remarks on the mind-body question,” in *The Scientist Speculates*, edited by I. J. Good (Heinemann and Basic Books, London and New York, 1961) pp. 284–302, reprinted in Ref. [138, pp. 168-181], <http://www.phys.uu.nl/igg/jos/foundQM/wigner.pdf>.
- [69] John von Neumann, *Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata* (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1966) a. W. Burks, editor.

- [70] S. Feferman, “Kurt Gödel: conviction and caution,” *Philosophia Naturalis* **21**, 546–562 (1984).
- [71] Laurence Sterne, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* (London, 1760-1767) <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/1079>.
- [72] David H. Wolpert, “Computational capabilities of physical systems,” *Physical Review E* **65**, 016128 (Dec 2001), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.65.016128>.
- [73] Cristian Calude, Douglas I. Campbell, Karl Svozil, and Doru Ștefănescu, “Strong determinism vs. computability,” in *The Foundational Debate. Complexity and Constructivity in Mathematics and Physics. Vienna Circle Institute Yearbook, Vol. 3*, edited by Werner DePauli Schimanovich, Eckehart Köhler, and Friedrich Stadler (Kluwer, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1995) pp. 115–131, ISBN 978-0-7923-3737-9, arXiv:quant-ph/9412004, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9412004>.
- [74] Časlav Brukner, “Quantum experiments can test mathematical undecidability,” in *Unconventional Computing. Unconventional Computation. Proceedings of the 7th International Conference, UC 2008, Vienna, Austria, August 25-28, 2008. Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Volume 5204/2008*, edited by C. S. Calude, J. F. G. Costa, R. Freund, M. Oswald, and G. Rozenberg (Springer, Berlin, 2003) pp. 1–5, ISBN 978-3-540-85193-6, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85194-3\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-85194-3_1).
- [75] Karl Svozil, “On the brightness of the Thomson lamp: A prolegomenon to quantum recursion theory,” in *UC '09: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Unconventional Computation*, edited by Cristian S. Calude, José Félix Costa, Nachum Dershowitz, Elisabete Freire, and Grzegorz Rozenberg (Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009) pp. 236–246, ISBN 978-3-642-03744-3, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03745-0\\_26](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03745-0_26).
- [76] Cristian S. Calude and Ludwig Staiger, “A note on accelerated Turing machines,” (2009), CDMTCS preprint nr. 350, 7 p., <http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/CDMTCS/researchreports/350cris.pdf>.
- [77] Tibor Rado, “On non-computable functions,” *The Bell System Technical Journal* **XLI(41)**, 877–884 (May 1962).
- [78] Gregory J. Chaitin, “Information-theoretic limitations of formal systems,” *Journal of the Association of Computing Machinery* **21**, 403–424 (1974), reprinted in Ref. [235], <http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/CDMTCS/chaitin/acm74.pdf>.
- [79] A. K. Dewdney, “Computer recreations: A computer trap for the busy beaver, the hardest-working Turing machine,” *Scientific American* **251**, 19–23 (August 1984).

- [80] A. H. Brady, “The busy beaver game and the meaning of life,” in *The Universal Turing Machine. A Half-Century Survey*, edited by R. Herken (Kammerer und Unverzagt, Hamburg, 1988) p. 259.
- [81] Gregory J. Chaitin, “Computing the busy beaver function,” in *Open Problems in Communication and Computation*, edited by T. M. Cover and B. Gopinath (Springer, New York, 1987) p. 108, reprinted in Ref. [235].
- [82] Mark E. Gold, “Language identification in the limit,” *Information and Control* **10**, 447–474 (1967), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(67\)91165-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(67)91165-5).
- [83] Lenore Blum and Manuel Blum, “Toward a mathematical theory of inductive inference,” *Information and Control* **28**, 125–155 (Jun. 1975).
- [84] Dana Angluin and Carl H. Smith, “A survey of inductive inference: Theory and methods,” *Computing Surveys* **15**, 237–269 (1983).
- [85] Leonard M. Adleman and M. Blum, “Inductive inference and unsolvability,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **56**, 891–900 (Sep. 1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2275058>.
- [86] M. Li and P. M. B. Vitányi, “Inductive reasoning and Kolmogorov complexity,” *Journal of Computer and System Science* **44**, 343–384 (1992), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(92\)90026-F](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(92)90026-F).
- [87] David Hilbert, “Über das Unendliche,” *Mathematische Annalen* **95**, 161–190 (1926), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01206605>.
- [88] Rudy Rucker, *Infinity and the Mind* (Birkhäuser, Boston, 1982).
- [89] Raymond M. Smullyan, *What is the name of this book?* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1992).
- [90] Oliver Aberth, *Computable Analysis* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1980).
- [91] Klaus Weihrauch, *Computable Analysis. An Introduction* (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2000).
- [92] G. Kreisel, “A notion of mechanistic theory,” *Synthese* **29**, 11–26 (1974), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00484949>.
- [93] Ernst Specker, “Nicht konstruktiv beweisbare Sätze der Analysis,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **14**, 145–158 (1949), reprinted in Ref. [236, pp. 35–48]; English translation: *Theorems of Analysis which cannot be proven constructively*.
- [94] Cristian S. Calude and Michael J. Dinneen, “Exact approximations of omega numbers,” *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **17**, 1937–1954 (2007), CDMTCS report series 293, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0218127407018130>.

- [95] Ernst Specker, “Der Satz vom Maximum in der rekursiven Analysis,” in *Constructivity in mathematics : proceedings of the colloquium held at Amsterdam, 1957*, edited by A. Heyting (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1959) pp. 254–265, reprinted in Ref. [236, pp. 148–159]; English translation: *Theorems of Analysis which cannot be proven constructively*.
- [96] Paul S. Wang, “The undecidability of the existence of zeros of real elementary functions,” *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **21**, 586–589 (1974), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/321850.321856>.
- [97] M. B. Pour-El and J. I. Richards, *Computability in Analysis and Physics* (Springer, Berlin, 1989).
- [98] Douglas S. Bridges, “Constructive mathematics and unbounded operators—a reply to Hellman,” *Journal of Philosophical Logic* **28** (1999), doi:“bibinfo doi 10.1023/A:1004420413391, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1004420413391>.
- [99] Bruno Scarpellini, “Zwei unentscheidbare Probleme der Analysis,” *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* **9**, 265–289 (1963), ISSN 1521-3870, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/malq.19630091802>.
- [100] Daniel Richardson, “Some undecidable problems involving elementary functions of a real variable,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **33**, 514–520 (1968), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2271358>.
- [101] M. Hirsch, “The chaos of dynamical systems. Lecture notes in pure and applied mathematics. Volume 98,” in *Chaos, fractals, and dynamics*, edited by P. Fischer and W. R. Smith (M. Dekker, New York, 1985).
- [102] N. C. A. da Costa, Francisco Antonio Doria, and A. F. Furtado do Amaral, “Dynamical system where proving chaos is equivalent to proving Fermat’s conjecture,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **32**, 2187–2206 (1993), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00675030>.
- [103] Ian Stewart, “Deciding the undecidable,” *Nature* **352**, 664–665 (1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/352664a0>.
- [104] A. J. Lichtenberg and M. A. Lieberman, *Regular and Stochastic Motion* (Springer, New York, 1983).
- [105] Vadim S. Anishchenko, Vladimir Astakhov, Alexander Neiman, Tatjana Vadivasova, and Lutz Schimansky-Geier, *Nonlinear Dynamics of Chaotic and Stochastic Systems Tutorial and Modern Developments. Tutorial and Modern Developments*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007).
- [106] A. M. Lyapunov, “The general problem of the stability of motion,” *International Journal of Control* **55**, 531–534 (1992), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207179208934253>.

- [107] Carl Weierstrass, Charles Hermite, and Gösta Mittag-Leffler, “Mittheilung, einen von König Oscar II gestifteten mathematischen Preis betreffend. Communication sur un prix de mathématiques fondé par le roi Oscar II,” *Acta Mathematica* **7**, I–VI (1885), ISSN 1871-2509, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02402191>.
- [108] Ivar Peterson, *Chaos in the Solar System* (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1993).
- [109] Florin Diacu, “The solution of the  $n$ -body problem,” *The Mathematical Intelligencer* **18**, 66–70 (1996), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03024313>.
- [110] Henri Poincaré, “Sur le problème des trois corps et les équations de la dynamique,” *Acta Mathematica* **13**, A3–A270 (1890), ISSN 1871-2509, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02392506>.
- [111] Lewis Campbell and William Garnett, *The life of James Clerk Maxwell. With a selection from his correspondence and occasional writings and a sketch of his contributions to science* (MacMillan, London, 1882) <http://www.sonnetsoftware.com/bio/maxbio.pdf>.
- [112] S. Smale, “Differentiable dynamical systems,” *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **73**, 747–817 (1967), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1967-11798-1>.
- [113] Robert S. Shaw, “Strange attractors, chaotic behavior, and information flow,” *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* **36a**, 80–112 (1981).
- [114] Per Martin-Löf, “The definition of random sequences,” *Information and Control* **9**, 602–619 (1966), ISSN 0019-9958, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-4018\(87\)90271-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-4018(87)90271-9).
- [115] Stan Wagon, *The Banach-Tarski paradox* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986).
- [116] Karl Svozil, “Set theory and physics,” *Foundations of Physics* **25**, 1541–1560 (1995), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02055507>.
- [117] L. K. Babadzanjan, “Analytical methods of computing perturbations of coordinates of the planets,” *Leningradskii Universitet Vestnik Matematika Mekhanika Astronomiia* **7**, 121–132 (1969).
- [118] L. K. Babadzanjan, “Existence of the continuations in the  $n$ -body problem,” *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* **20**, 43–57 (1979), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01236607>.
- [119] Qui Dong Wang, “The global solution of the  $n$ -body problem,” *Celestial Mechanics* **50**, 73–88 (1991), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00048987>.
- [120] Qui Dong Wang, “Power series solutions and integral manifold of the  $n$ -body problem,” *Regular & Chaotic Dynamics* **6**, 433–442 (2001), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1070/RD2001v006n04ABEH000187>.

- [121] L. K. Babadzanjanz, “On the global solution of the  $n$ -body problem,” *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* **56**, 427–449 (1993), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00691812>.
- [122] L. K. Babadzanjanz and D. R. Sarkissian, “Taylor series method for dynamical systems with control: Convergence and error estimates,” *Journal of Mathematical Sciences* **139**, 7025–7046 (2006), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10958-006-0404-3>.
- [123] Karl Fritiof Sundman, “Memoire sur le problème de trois corps,” *Acta Mathematica* **36**, 105–179 (1912), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02422379>.
- [124] Christiane Rousseau, “Divergent series: past, present, future ...,” (2004), preprint, <http://www.dms.umontreal.ca/~rousseac/divergent.pdf>.
- [125] E. Fredkin and T. Toffoli, “Conservative logic,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **21**, 219–253 (1982), reprinted in Ref. [237, Part I, Chapter 3]., <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01857727>.
- [126] Norman Margolus, “Universal cellular automata based on the collisions of soft spheres,” in *Collision-based computing*, edited by Andrew Adamatzky (Springer, London, 2002) pp. 107–134, <http://people.csail.mit.edu/nhm/cca.pdf>.
- [127] Karl Svozil, “Omega and the time evolution of the  $n$ -body problem,” in *Randomness and Complexity, from Leibniz to Chaitin*, edited by Cristian S. Calude (World Scientific, Singapore, 2007) pp. 231–236, eprint arXiv:physics/0703031, arXiv:physics/0703031, <http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0703031>.
- [128] Karl Svozil, “Quantum scholasticism: On quantum contexts, counterfactuals, and the absurdities of quantum omniscience,” *Information Sciences* **179**, 535–541 (2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2008.06.012>.
- [129] Lev Vaidman, “Counterfactuals in quantum mechanics,” in *Compendium of Quantum Physics*, edited by Daniel Greenberger, Klaus Hentschel, and Friedel Weinert (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007) pp. 132–136, arXiv:0709.0340, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70626-7\\_40](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70626-7_40).
- [130] Jeffrey Bub, *Interpreting the quantum world* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999) ISBN 0-521-65386-x.
- [131] Max Jammer, *The Conceptual Development of Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1966).
- [132] Max Jammer, *The Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1974).
- [133] Max Jammer, “John Steward Bell and the debate on the significance of his contributions to the foundations of quantum mechanics,” in *Bell’s Theorem and the Foundations of Modern Physics*, edited

- by A. van der Merwe, F. Selleri, and G. Tarozzi (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992) pp. 1–23.
- [134] John Clauser, “Early history of Bell’s theorem,” in *Quantum (Un)speakables. From Bell to Quantum Information*, edited by Reinhold Bertlmann and Anton Zeilinger (Springer, Berlin, 2002) pp. 61–96, ISBN 978-3-540-42756-8.
- [135] J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, “Bell’s theorem: experimental tests and implications,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **41**, 1881–1926 (1978), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0034-4885/41/12/002>.
- [136] N. D. Mermin, “Hidden variables and the two theorems of John Bell,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **65**, 803–815 (1993), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.65.803>.
- [137] Max Born, “Zur Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **37**, 863–867 (1926), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01397477>.
- [138] John Archibald Wheeler and Wojciech Hubert Zurek, *Quantum Theory and Measurement* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1983).
- [139] Max Born, “Quantenmechanik der Stoßvorgänge,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **38**, 803–827 (1926), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01397184>.
- [140] Max Jammer, *The Conceptual Development of Quantum Mechanics. The History of Modern Physics, 1800-1950*; v. 12, 2nd ed. (American Institute of Physics, New York, 1989).
- [141] Thomas J. Herzog, Paul G. Kwiat, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Complementarity and the quantum eraser,” *Physical Review Letters* **75**, 3034–3037 (1995), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.75.3034>.
- [142] Daniel M. Greenberger and Alain Aspect, ““Haunted” measurements in quantum theory,” *Foundation of Physics* **19**, 679–704 (1989), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00731905>.
- [143] Otto E. Rössler, *Endophysics. The World as an Interface* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998) with a foreword by Peter Weibel.
- [144] Hugh Everett, “‘relative state’ formulation of quantum mechanics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, 454–462 (1957), reprinted in Ref. [138, pp. 315-323], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.29.454>.
- [145] Erwin Schrödinger, “Die gegenwärtige Situation in der Quantenmechanik,” *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807–812, 823–828, 844–849 (1935), English translation in Ref. [238] and in Ref. [138, pp. 152-167], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01491891>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01491914>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01491987>.

- [146] Erwin Schrödinger, *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics. Dublin seminars (1949-1955) and other unpublished essays* (Ox Bow Press, Woodbridge, Connecticut, 1995).
- [147] Cristian S. Calude and Karl Svozil, “Quantum randomness and value indefiniteness,” *Advanced Science Letters* **1**, 165–168 (December 2008), arXiv:quant-ph/0611029, <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/asp/asl/2008/00000001/00000002/art00004>.
- [148] Karl Svozil, “Contexts in quantum, classical and partition logic,” in *Handbook of Quantum Logic and Quantum Structures*, edited by Kurt Engesser, Dov M. Gabbay, and Daniel Lehmann (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2009) pp. 551–586, arXiv:quant-ph/0609209, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0609209>.
- [149] Paul R. Halmos, *Finite-dimensional vector spaces* (Springer, New York, Heidelberg, Berlin, 1974).
- [150] Anton Zeilinger, “A foundational principle for quantum mechanics,” *Foundations of Physics* **29**, 631–643 (1999), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018820410908>.
- [151] Niko Donath and Karl Svozil, “Finding a state among a complete set of orthogonal ones,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **65**, 044302 (2002), quant-ph/0105046, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.65.044302>.
- [152] Karl Svozil, “Quantum information in base  $n$  defined by state partitions,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **66**, 044306 (2002), quant-ph/0205031, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.66.044306>.
- [153] Karl Svozil, “The quantum coin toss—testing microphysical undecidability,” *Physics Letters A* **143**, 433–437 (1990), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601\(90\)90408-G](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(90)90408-G).
- [154] J. G. Rarity, M. P. C. Owens, and P. R. Tapster, “Quantum random-number generation and key sharing,” *Journal of Modern Optics* **41**, 2435–2444 (1994), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500349414552281>.
- [155] Thomas Jennewein, Ulrich Achleitner, Gregor Weihs, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “A fast and compact quantum random number generator,” *Review of Scientific Instruments* **71**, 1675–1680 (2000), quant-ph/9912118, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1150518>.
- [156] André Stefanov, Nicolas Gisin, Olivier Guinnard, Laurent Guinnard, and Hugo Zbinden, “Optical quantum random number generator,” *Journal of Modern Optics* **47**, 595–598 (2000), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/095003400147908>.
- [157] Ma Hai-Qiang, Wang Su-Mei, Zhang Da, Chang Jun-Tao, Ji Ling-Ling, Hou Yan-Xue, and Wu Ling-An, “A random number generator based on quantum entangled photon pairs,” *Chinese Physics Let-*

- ters **21**, 1961–1964 (2004), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0256-307X/21/10/027>.
- [158] P. X. Wang, G. L. Long, and Y. S. Li, “Scheme for a quantum random number generator,” *Journal of Applied Physics* **100**, 056107 (2006), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2338830>.
- [159] M. Fiorentino, C. Santori, S. M. Spillane, R. G. Beausoleil, and W. J. Munro, “Secure self-calibrating quantum random-bit generator,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **75**, 032334 (2007), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.75.032334>.
- [160] Karl Svozil, “Three criteria for quantum random-number generators based on beam splitters,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **79**, 054306 (2009), arXiv:0903.2744, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.054306>.
- [161] Gregor Weihs, Thomas Jennewein, Christoph Simon, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Violation of Bell’s inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions,” *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 5039–5043 (1998), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039>.
- [162] Cristian S. Calude, “Algorithmic randomness, quantum physics, and incompleteness,” in *Proceedings of the Conference “Machines, Computations and Universality” (MCU’2004)*, edited by M. Margenstern (Lectures Notes in Comput. Sci. 3354, Springer, Berlin, 2005) pp. 1–17.
- [163] Cristian S. Calude and Michael J. Dinneen, “Is quantum randomness algorithmic random? a preliminary attack,” in *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Algebraic Informatics*, edited by S. Bozapalidis, A. Kalampakas, and G. Rahonis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, 2005) pp. 195–196.
- [164] Wolfgang Pauli, “Die allgemeinen Prinzipien der Wellenmechanik,” in *Handbuch der Physik. Band V, Teil 1. Prinzipien der Quantentheorie I*, edited by S. Flügge (Springer, Berlin, Göttingen and Heidelberg, 1958) pp. 1–168.
- [165] Erwin Schrödinger, “Discussion of probability relations between separated systems,” *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **31**, 555–563 (1935), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0305004100013554>.
- [166] Erwin Schrödinger, “Probability relations between separated systems,” *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **32**, 446–452 (1936), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0305004100019137>.
- [167] Karl Svozil, “Are simultaneous Bell measurements possible?,” *New Journal of Physics* **8**, 39 (2006), quant-ph/0401113, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/8/3/039>.

- [168] Ron Wright, “Generalized urn models,” *Foundations of Physics* **20**, 881–903 (1990), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01889696>.
- [169] Ron Wright, “The state of the pentagon. A nonclassical example,” in *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*, edited by A. R. Marlow (Academic Press, New York, 1978) pp. 255–274.
- [170] Karl Svozil, “Logical equivalence between generalized urn models and finite automata,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **44**, 745–754 (2005), [quant-ph/0209136](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10773-005-7052-0), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10773-005-7052-0>.
- [171] Edward F. Moore, “Gedanken-experiments on sequential machines,” in *Automata Studies*, edited by C. E. Shannon and J. McCarthy (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1956) pp. 129–153.
- [172] Martin Schaller and Karl Svozil, “Automaton logic,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **35**, 911–940 (May 1996), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02302381>.
- [173] Anatolij Dvurečenskij, Sylvia Pulmannová, and Karl Svozil, “Partition logics, orthoalgebras and automata,” *Helvetica Physica Acta* **68**, 407–428 (1995).
- [174] Cristian Calude, Elena Calude, Karl Svozil, and Sheng Yu, “Physical versus computational complementarity I,” *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* **36**, 1495–1523 (1997), [arXiv:quant-ph/9412004](http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9412004), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02435752>.
- [175] Karl Svozil, “Staging quantum cryptography with chocolate balls,” *American Journal of Physics* **74**, 800–803 (2006), [physics/0510050](http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0510050), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1119/1.2205879>.
- [176] Garrett Birkhoff and John von Neumann, “The logic of quantum mechanics,” *Annals of Mathematics* **37**, 823–843 (1936), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1968621>.
- [177] Simon Kochen and Ernst P. Specker, “The calculus of partial propositional functions,” in *Proceedings of the 1964 International Congress for Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, Jerusalem* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1965) pp. 45–57, reprinted in Ref. [236, pp. 222–234].
- [178] Gudrun Kalmbach, *Orthomodular Lattices* (Academic Press, New York, 1983).
- [179] Gudrun Kalmbach, *Measures and Hilbert Lattices* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1986).
- [180] Pavel Pták and Sylvia Pulmannová, *Orthomodular Structures as Quantum Logics* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1991).
- [181] Mirko Navara and V. Rogalewicz, “The pasting constructions for orthomodular posets,” *Mathematische Nachrichten* **154**, 157–168 (1991).
- [182] Karl Svozil, *Quantum Logic* (Springer, Singapore, 1998).

- [183] Ernst Specker, “Die Logik nicht gleichzeitig entscheidbarer Aussagen,” *Dialectica* **14**, 239–246 (1960), reprinted in Ref. [236, pp. 175–182]; English translation: *The logic of propositions which are not simultaneously decidable*, Reprinted in Ref. [239, pp. 135–140], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-8361.1960.tb00422.x>.
- [184] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Christian Classics, USA, 1981) <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.html>.
- [185] Walter Terence Stace, “The refutation of realism,” in *Readings in philosophical analysis*, edited by Herbert Feigl and Wilfrid Sellars (Appleton–Century–Crofts, New York, 1949) previously published in *Mind* **53**, 1934.
- [186] Harald Atmanspacher and Hans Primas, “Epistemic and ontic quantum realities,” in *Foundations of Probability and Physics – 3, AIP Conference Proceedings Volume 750*, edited by Andrei Khrennikov (Springer, New York, Berlin, 2005) pp. 49–62, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1874557>.
- [187] George Boole, *An investigation of the laws of thought* (Dover edition, New York, 1958).
- [188] George Boole, “On the theory of probabilities,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* **152**, 225–252 (1862).
- [189] Itamar Pitowsky, “George Boole’s ‘conditions of possible experience’ and the quantum puzzle,” *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **45**, 95–125 (1994), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjps/45.1.95>.
- [190] Asher Peres, “Unperformed experiments have no results,” *American Journal of Physics* **46**, 745–747 (1978), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1119/1.11393>.
- [191] Gregor Weihs, Thomas Jennewein, Christoph Simon, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Violation of Bell’s inequality under strict Einstein locality conditions,” *Physical Review Letters* **81**, 5039–5043 (1998), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.5039>.
- [192] Karl Svozil, “Quantum value indefiniteness,” (2010), arXiv:1001.1436.
- [193] Abner Shimony, “Controllable and uncontrollable non-locality,” in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, edited by S. Kamefuchi *et al.* (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1984) pp. 225–230, see also J. Jarrett, *Bell’s Theorem, Quantum Mechanics and Local Realism*, Ph. D. thesis, Univ. of Chicago, 1983; *Nous*, **18**, 569 (1984).
- [194] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, “Quantum nonlocality as an axiom,” *Foundations of Physics* **24**, 379–358 (1994), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02058098>.

- [195] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, “Action and passion at a distance: an essay in honor of professor Abner Shimony,” *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science* **194**, 197–206 (1997), quant-ph/9605004, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9605004>.
- [196] Günther Krenn and Karl Svozil, “Stronger-than-quantum correlations,” *Foundations of Physics* **28**, 971–984 (1998), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018821314465>.
- [197] Karl Svozil, “Communication cost of breaking the Bell barrier,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **72**, 050302(R) (2005), physics/0510050, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.72.050302>.
- [198] Simon Kochen and Ernst P. Specker, “The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics,” *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics (now Indiana University Mathematics Journal)* **17**, 59–87 (1967), ISSN 0022-2518, reprinted in Ref. [236, pp. 235–263], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1512/iumj.1968.17.17004>.
- [199] Neal Zierler and Michael Schlessinger, “Boolean embeddings of orthomodular sets and quantum logic,” *Duke Mathematical Journal* **32**, 251–262 (1965).
- [200] V. Alda, “On 0-1 measures for projectors i,” *Aplik. mate.* **25**, 373–374 (1980).
- [201] V. Alda, “On 0-1 measures for projectors ii,” *Aplik. mate.* **26**, 57–58 (1981).
- [202] Franz Kamber, “Die Struktur des Aussagenkalküls in einer physikalischen Theorie,” *Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen* **10**, 103–124 (1964).
- [203] Franz Kamber, “Zweiwertige Wahrscheinlichkeitsfunktionen auf orthokomplementären Verbänden,” *Mathematische Annalen* **158**, 158–196 (1965).
- [204] Karl Svozil and Josef Tkadlec, “Greechie diagrams, nonexistence of measures in quantum logics and Kochen–Specker type constructions,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **37**, 5380–5401 (November 1996), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.531710>.
- [205] Adán Cabello, José M. Estebarez, and G. García-Alcaine, “Bell-Kochen-Specker theorem: A proof with 18 vectors,” *Physics Letters A* **212**, 183–187 (1996), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601\(96\)00134-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(96)00134-X).
- [206] Niels Bohr, “Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics,” in *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, edited by P. A. Schilpp (The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, Ill., 1949) pp. 200–241, <http://www.emr.hibu.no/lars/eng/schilpp/Default.html>.
- [207] John S. Bell, “On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **38**, 447–452 (1966), reprinted in Ref. [240, pp. 1-13], <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/>

RevModPhys.38.447.

- [208] Peter Heywood and Michael L. G. Redhead, “Nonlocality and the Kochen-Specker paradox,” *Foundations of Physics* **13**, 481–499 (1983), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00729511>.
- [209] Michael Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality, and Realism: A Prolegomenon to the Philosophy of Quantum Mechanics* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990).
- [210] Karl Svozil, “Proposed direct test of a certain type of noncontextuality in quantum mechanics,” *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)* **80**, 040102 (2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.80.040102>.
- [211] Karl Svozil, “Quantum information via state partitions and the context translation principle,” *Journal of Modern Optics* **51**, 811–819 (2004), quant-ph/0308110, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500340410001664179>.
- [212] John C. Eccles, “The mind-brain problem revisited: The microsite hypothesis,” in *The Principles of Design and Operation of the Brain*, edited by John C. Eccles and O. Creutzfeldt (Springer, Berlin, 1990) p. 549.
- [213] Karl Raimund Popper and John C. Eccles, *The Self and Its Brain* (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, London, New York, 1977).
- [214] H. Putnam, *Reason, Truth and History* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981).
- [215] Karl Svozil, “A constructivist manifesto for the physical sciences — Constructive re-interpretation of physical undecidability,” in *The Foundational Debate, Complexity and Constructivity in Mathematics and Physics*, edited by Werner DePauli Schimanovich, Eckehart Köhler, and Friedrich Stadler (Kluwer, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 1995) pp. 65–88, see also Ref. [241], <http://tph.tuwien.ac.at/~svozil/publ/1994-interface.pdf>.
- [216] Konrad Zuse, *Calculating Space. MIT Technical Translation AZT-70-164-GEMIT* (MIT (Proj. MAC), Cambridge, MA, 1970).
- [217] Edward Fredkin, “Digital mechanics. an informational process based on reversible universal cellular automata,” *Physica* **D45**, 254–270 (1990), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789\(90\)90186-S](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(90)90186-S).
- [218] Stephen Wolfram, *A New Kind of Science* (Wolfram Media, Inc., Champaign, IL, 2002).
- [219] Karl Svozil, “Computational universes,” *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* **25**, 845–859 (2006), physics/0305048, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2004.11.055>.

- [220] Gregory J. Chaitin, “Irreducible complexity in pure,” (2004), math/0411091, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0411091>.
- [221] Gregory J. Chaitin, “The halting probability Omega: Irreducible complexity in pure mathematics,” *Milan Journal of Mathematics* **75**, 291–304 (2007), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00032-006-0064-2>.
- [222] George Marsaglia, “The Marsaglia random number CDROM including the diehard battery of tests of randomness,” (1995), <http://www.stat.fsu.edu/pub/diehard/>.
- [223] Andrew Rukhin, Juan Soto, James Nechvatal, Miles Smid, Elaine Barker, Stefan Leigh, Mark Levenson, Mark Vangel, David Banks, Alan Hekert, James Dray, and San Vo, *A Statistical Test Suite for Random and Pseudorandom Number Generators for Cryptographic Applications. NIST Special Publication 800-22* (National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), 2001) <http://csrc.nist.gov/groups/ST/toolkit/rng/documents/SP800-22b.pdf>.
- [224] Pierre L’Ecuyer and Richard Simard, “Testu01: A C library for empirical testing of random number generators,” *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)* **33**, 22 (2007), ISSN 0098-3500, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1268776.1268777>.
- [225] C.S. Calude, M.J. Dinneen, M. Dumitrescu, and K. Svozil, *How Random Is Quantum Randomness? (Extended Version)*, Report CDMTCS-372 (Centre for Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand, 2009) arXiv:0912.4379, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.4379>.
- [226] David Bailey, Peter Borwein, and Simon Plouffe, “On the rapid computation of various polylogarithmic constants,” *Mathematics of Computation* **66**, 903–913 (1997), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-97-00856-9>.
- [227] David H. Bailey and Jonathan M. Borwein, “Experimental mathematics: Examples, methods and implications,” *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* **52**, 502–514 (2005), <http://www.ams.org/notices/200505/fea-borwein.pdf>.
- [228] Cristian S. Calude and Gregory J. Chaitin, “What is ... a halting probability?,” *Notices of the AMS* **57**, 236–237 (2007), <http://www.ams.org/notices/201002/rtx100200236p.pdf>.
- [229] John von Neumann, “Various techniques used in connection with random digits,” *National Bureau of Standards Applied Math Series* **12**, 36–38 (1951), reprinted in *John von Neumann, Collected Works*, (Vol. V), A. H. Traub, editor, MacMillan, New York, 1963, p. 768–770.

- [230] The RAND Corporation, *A Million Random Digits with 100,000 Normal Deviates* Free Press Publishers (Knolls Atomic Power Lab. Report KAPL-3147, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955) the data digits are obtainable via [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/2005/digits.txt.zip](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/2005/digits.txt.zip), the introduction via [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1418/index2.html](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1418/index2.html), [http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\\_reports/MR1418/](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1418/).
- [231] Helle Bechmann-Pasquinucci and Asher Peres, “Quantum cryptography with 3-state systems,” *Physical Review Letters* **85**, 3313–3316 (Oct 2000), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.85.3313>.
- [232] Paul A. Samuelson, “Constructing an unbiased random sequence,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **63**, 1526–1527 (1968), ISSN 01621459, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2285902>.
- [233] Philipp Frank and R. S. Cohen (Editor), *The Law of Causality and its Limits (Vienna Circle Collection)* (Springer, Vienna, 1997) ISBN 0792345517.
- [234] Rolf Landauer, “Advertisement for a paper I like,” in *On Limits*, edited by John L. Casti and J. F. Traub (Santa Fe Institute Report 94-10-056, Santa Fe, NM, 1994) p. 39, <http://www.santafe.edu/research/publications/workingpapers/94-10-056.pdf>.
- [235] Gregory J. Chaitin, *Information, Randomness and Incompleteness*, 2nd ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990) this is a collection of G. Chaitin’s early publications.
- [236] Ernst Specker, *Selecta* (Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1990).
- [237] Andrew Adamatzky, *Collision-based computing* (Springer, London, 2002).
- [238] J. D. Trimmer, “The present situation in quantum mechanics: a translation of Schrödinger’s “cat paradox”,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* **124**, 323–338 (1980), reprinted in Ref. [138, pp. 152-167], <http://www.tu-harburg.de/rzt/rzt/it/QM/cat.html>.
- [239] Clifford Alan Hooker, *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics. Volume I: Historical Evolution* (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1975).
- [240] John S. Bell, *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- [241] Karl Svozil, “One-to-one,” *Complexity* **42**, 25–29 (1998), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0526\(199809/10\)4:1<25::AID-CPLX8>3.0.CO;2-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0526(199809/10)4:1<25::AID-CPLX8>3.0.CO;2-9).